State Planning Grant Consultant Team
University of Washington Health Policy Analysis Program
Rutgers University Center for State Health Policy **RAND**

William M. Mercer, Incorporated
The Foundation for Health Care Quality

Options for Distilling the Current Array of Washington State Medical Benefit Packages

Submitted to

Washington State Planning Grant on Access to Health Insurance

Funded by

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Grant #1 P09 OA00002-01

June 2002

Produced for the Washington State Planning Grant on Access to Health Insurance. Funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Grant #1 P09 OA00002-01.

This report was prepared by Florence G. Katz, of Mercer Human Resource Consulting (formerly William M. Mercer, Incorporated).

This report was prepared by a consultant team comprising:

University of Washington Health Policy Analysis Program

Aaron Katz, Director and Co-Principal Investigator
Suzanne Swadener, Project Manager
Mark Gardner, Senior Policy Analyst
Jennifer Phipps, Policy Analyst
Judith Yarrow, Editor
Carolyn A. Watts, Professor and Faculty Associate
Robert Crittenden, Associate Professor, Department of Family Medicine
Peter House, Clinical Associate Professor, Department of Family Medicine
Larkin Strong, Research Assistant

Rutgers University Center for State Health Policy

Joel Cantor, Director and Co-Principal Investigator Kimberley Fox, Senior Policy Analyst Cara Cuite, Research Analyst

RAND

M. Susan Marquis, Senior Economist Roald Euller, Associate Director of Research Programming

William M. Mercer, Incorporated

James Matthisen, Principal Florence Katz, Senior Consultant David Frazzini, Associate Judy Miller, Consultant

Foundation for Health Care Quality/Community Health Information Technology Alliance (CHITA)

Elizabeth Ward, CHITA Director Elizabeth Whitney-Teeple, Consultant

Health Policy Analysis Program University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine 1107 NE 45th St., Suite 400, Seattle, WA 98105 Phone 206-543-3670, Fax 206-543-9345, www.hpap.washington.edu

Center for State Health Policy Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey 314 George St., Suite 400, New Brunswick, NJ 08901 Phone 732-932-3105, Fax 732-932-0069, www.cshp.rutgers.edu

Table of Contents

| Intro | duction | 1 |
|-------|---|----|
| Meth | odology | 2 |
| Sumr | mary of Data Assessment and Conclusion | 2 |
| Refer | ences | 4 |
| Appe | ndices | |
| A. | Data Assessment | 6 |
| В. | TREbase Data on Values of Selected Plan Design Elements – By Plan Type | 19 |
| C. | Mercer/Foster Higgins National Survey of Employer-Sponsored Health Plans 2000 | 23 |
| D. | Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Employer Health Insurance Survey | 25 |
| E. | Washington State Planning Grant on Access to Health Insurance Private Payer Questionnaire | 29 |
| F. | Summary of Responses to Private Payer Questionnaire and a "Combined" Response | 37 |
| G. | Washington State Mandated Benefits | 67 |

Options for Distilling the Current Array of Washington State Medical Benefit Packages

Introduction

This task summary is presented to the program staff of the Washington State Planning Grant on Access to Health Insurance. It represents the research findings and opinions of the consultant team. As you seek feedback from stakeholders, we are confident that you will find this information provides solid grounding for discussions on the work conducted by the consultant team.

As part of the project, the consulting team explored the potential to distill the range of insurance products available in the marketplace into a finite set that would maintain consumers' choices, reduce complexity and cost to the system and increase consumers' ability to comparison shop for coverage. A market with distilled benefits would likely include a limited number of benefit packages, but those packages might in some cases be richer (have more benefits than required by current law) and in other cases might be streamlined (have reduced benefits).

At present, medical policies cover physician services, inpatient hospital care, prescription drug services, maternity services, mental health counseling, chemical dependency and substance abuse (behavioral health) treatment, rehabilitation services, neurodevelopmental care, spinal manipulation, and a host of other clinical services. Distillation might involve such activities as:

- Categorizing existing packages into similar groupings or families, organizing these families
 of similar packages along a continuum and developing a package representative of each
 grouping.
- Defining and using a core package of benefits (e.g., covering physician services, inpatient hospital care, prescription drug services and maternity services) which is common among most or all plans, and categorizing other benefits (e.g. wellness benefits, alternative care services) in a consistent fashion to facilitate member comparison and understanding.
- Defining and using common insurance plan cost sharing levels for specified covered services (e.g., providing full office visit coverage after a \$15 copayment; or, paying 80% of covered charges, leaving the patient responsible for the remaining 20% and any excess charge by the provider of care)
- Refining exclusions or limitations on coverage

Conceptually, access to health insurance or health care might be expanded through benefit distillation by:

• Improving the general understanding of benefits and necessary care, thereby facilitating more appropriate health system utilization and patient cost sharing and lowering overall benefit

- expenses. For example, individuals might be less likely to obtain care and incur expenses for services that are explicitly and consistently not covered. (This could also reduce claim appeals and the need for benefit exceptions.)
- Reducing the search costs for consumers and purchasers, moderating one barrier to obtaining coverage.
- Reducing marketing, education, and plan administrative costs of payers and plan sponsors by simplifying plan designs and reducing their number and variety. Reduction of costs could affect overall premiums, thereby reducing to some extent the issue of cost as a barrier to purchasing coverage.
- Increasing the willingness of providers to offer services covered by insurance, perhaps because of reduced overhead requirements or a reduced "administrative hassle factor."
- Increasing the bargaining power of group purchasers when negotiating contracts with providers and payers, although it is unclear whether this power would translate into administrative fee savings

Methodology

To explore this issue, the researchers:

- Reviewed plan design data from three proprietary databases focusing on employer-sponsored coverage
- Reviewed mandated benefits for Washington insured plans
- Conducted a survey of major payers in Washington State
- Met with and interviewed representatives of some of the payers
- Investigated the standardization of Medicare Supplement (Medigap) products in the early 1990s
- Explored the experience of other states that had standardized benefits

Summary of Data Assessment and Conclusion

Based on these activities, we determined that:

- Washington medical benefit plans are primarily managed care plans (PPOs and HMOs), with
 no in-network deductibles and copayments for network provider care required at the time of
 service. Out-of-network deductibles generally range between \$200 and \$300 per individual
 per year, with family deductibles often a multiple of the individual deductible. Out-of-pocket
 maximums tend to be set for individuals only
- Mandated benefits necessarily affect those plans subject to state insurance law, although certain federal mandates also apply (e.g., with regard to mother's and newborn coverage, mastectomy benefits, mental health benefit levels). Although self-insured (ERISA) plans are not subject to state mandates, state mandates are often adopted to maintain the

competitiveness of self-insured plans. While mandated benefits can be used to define a basic product, critics see mandates as symptoms of unnecessary regulatory intervention, drivers of health care costs and evidence of political favoritism (toward certain provider or patient groups). Certain providers and consumers support selected mandates

- Payers appear to cover many of the same services, and use common cost sharing levels, benefit maximums and exclusions
- Some payers are sympathetic to the State's concern about expanding health insurance coverage, but are not convinced of the need for benefit distillation in light of the marketing advantages they enjoy because of offering plan design flexibility, market demand for changing and increasing benefits, and existing benefit mandates and rating rules
- The distillation of Medicare Supplement products was successful due to the simplicity of
 policies that were designed, their accepted purpose (anti-fraud, pro-consumer), the
 compromises made to accommodate consumers and insurers, and the trusted leadership of the
 Medigap distillation and standardization effort
- Benefit distillation in other states typically involves other aspects of market reform (e.g., use of purchasing cooperatives, new underwriting rules, rating and pricing restrictions). The success of other states with regard to benefit distillation has varied

Detailed information gathered from our major data sources is discussed in **Appendix A**. We have not explored the idea of benefit distillation to date with health care providers, individuals (consumers), employers (businesses), regulators, or agents (brokers) and do not expect to continue this analysis in light of limitations in available data.

References

Alecxih, L., Lutzky, S., Sevak, P., and Claxton, G. (1977 August). Key Issues Affecting Accessibility to Medigap Insurance. *The Commonwealth Fund*.

Duplantier, F. R. Personal correspondence, week of September 7, 1997. We Can Learn a Lesson from Kentucky.

Fox, P.D., Snyder, R., Dallek, G., and Rice, T. (1999 July/August), Should Medicare HMO Benefits Be Standardized? *Health Affairs. Volume 18. Number 4.*

Georgetown University Institute for Health Care Research & Policy. (2002, January 23). Interview with Gary Claxton.

Hall, M.A., J.D. and Wicks, E., Ph.D. (1999). An Evaluation of Iowa's Health Insurance Reform Laws, working paper. *Wake Forest University School of Medicine*.

Health Care Authority, Washington State. (2002, January 17). Interview with Melodie Bankers, J.D., formerly with the Washington State Office of the Insurance Commissioner.

Howard, L.S. (1990). NAIC Plans Medigap Poll for Seniors. National Underwriter.

Insurer Stakeholder Focus Group. (2001 December 4). Focus group participants: Thomas P. Beecken, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound, Executive Director of Actuarial & Underwriting; Robert Bray, CIGNA Health Care, Vice President of Sales & Underwriting; Jon Hendrix, Aetna, Sales Manager for Northwest Region Sales & Marketing.

Jones, D.C. (1991). NAIC Develops Nine Different Medigap Plans. National Underwriter.

McCubbin, R. The Kentucky Health Care Experiment: How 'Managed Competition' Clamps Down on Choice and Competition. Washington D.C.: *The Heritage Foundation*.

Meier, C.F., How Kentucky Destroyed Its Health Insurance Industry (and a Plan to Rescue It), *The Heartland Institute*. NO DATE

Office of the Insurance Commissioner, Washington State, Policy Division (2002, January), *Mandated Benefits in Washington*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Office of the Insurance Commissioner.

Regence Blue Shield. (2002, January 21). Interview with Margaret Lane, Vice President for Planning & Products.

Research Triangle Institute. (1998). 1997 Employer Health Insurance Survey: Final Methodology Report. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Swartz, K. and Garnick, D.W. (2000, February). Lessons from New Jersey. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law. Volume* 25, pp 45-70.

Swartz, K. and Garnick, D.W. (1999, December). Lessons learned from New Jersey's Individual Health Insurance Reform Program. *Medical Care Research and Review*.

Swartz, K., Garnick, D.W., and Skwara, K.C. (March/April 1998). Insurance Agents: Ignored Players in Health Insurance Reform. *Health Affairs*.